

REMARKS

Amendments to the drawings are presented as noted above to change the reference numeral "13" to "73." Also, the specification has been amended to add the reference numeral 73 and to express features of the seal that would have been clear to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the filing date. It is submitted that the amendments do not introduce any new matter.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 12-15, 17 and 19 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Veitch in view of Hickle.

Claim 12 has been amended to clarify the invention by adding the recitation that the seal has a lifetime of a plurality of cycles of the cassette. This was clearly disclosed in the application as originally filed and does not present new matter.

As noted in the office action, Veitch provides no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to place an RFID type device in the seal of a container. The Office then looks to Hickle to provide that reason, but it is submitted that Hickle would not provide one of ordinary skill in the art any reason to provide a RFID in the seal of a cassette as now recited, because Hickle does not provide the kind of seal contemplated by the invention. Instead, Hickle suggests only a tamper-evident type of seal that is not placed between a lid and a tray of a container and intended to be reused. Specifically, the Hickle "seal" is not intended to tightly close the container and be reused for a plurality of cycles.

The Hickle seal is a tearable conductive loop that is used only once because it is destroyed when the container is opened. Thus the Hickle "seal" merely indicates whether the container has been tampered with. Applicant's seal, on the other hand, is a completely different type of seal that functions to ensure a tight fit between the lid and the tray of the cassette and is reusable for a number of cycles of the cassette.

Applicant submits that the only modification of the Veitch sample container suggested by Hickle would be to provide the Veitch container with a tamper evident conductive loop for indicating whether the Veitch container has or has not been opened. Nothing in either of these references would have given one of ordinary skill in the art any reason to put the RFID tag in a seal of Veitch (which seal is even shown in the first place).

Thus, neither Veitch nor Hickle provides any reason to provide the claimed structure.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 18 and 20 under 35USC §103 as unpatentable over Veitch, Hickle, and Teller. As noted above, neither Veitch nor Hickle teaches the invention of claim 12, and it is submitted that Teller does not provide any teaching that would remedy any of the deficiencies discussed above.

Accordingly, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any outstanding issues.

All necessary extensions of time are hereby requested. Please charge any fees to deposit account 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,
CLARK & BRODY


Conrad J. Clark
Conrad J. Clark
Registration No. 30,340

Customer No. 22902
1090 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Suite 250
Washington D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-835-1111
Facsimile: 202-835-1755
Date: September 14, 2009